

1. **QUESTION:** Is only one proposal per institution permitted? If the answer is yes, does a submission from the XXX Institute preclude its sponsors, YYY University and the University of ZZZ from submitting separate proposals? (Note: names withheld to protect confidentiality of identity of offeror).

ANSWER: An institution may submit as many proposals as it wishes, but these proposals will then necessarily be judged in competition with each other as well as with those from elsewhere. Therefore each qualified institution or group of collaborating institutions is encouraged to submit a single unified proposal that best expresses its capabilities and ideas. An institution can only receive one contract award.

2. **QUESTION:** Is it the intent of AHRQ to first screen offerors for capability, to establish a list of qualified offerors, and then to issue Task Orders to them? If the answer is yes, then what level of project detail, project budget, and small disadvantaged business inclusion is required in the response due on 31 July?

ANSWER: AHRQ does intend first to screen offerors for capability, to establish a list of qualified offerors, and then to issue task orders to them. The level of project detail required in the response due on July 31 should be sufficient to give ample demonstration not only of the offeror's potential but also of the extent to which the offeror has analyzed the issues raised by the solicitation and synthesized promising approaches to resolve them. No project budgets are being requested. The only cost information required is that outlined in the RFP (direct labor rates and indirect cost rates). Goals for small disadvantaged businesses should be based on the maximum contract value for the base year. The RFP indicates that the maximum value per year of the contract is \$2,000,000. So, it is requested that you provide small business goals based on an estimated \$2,000,000 per year.

3. **QUESTION:** What level of detail or certainty is expected in the Small Business Plan at this point, that is, until Task Orders are issued and the contribution and participation of small businesses can be determined in accordance with project requirements?

ANSWER: Base your plan using the assumption of the maximum dollar value of the contract (\$2,000,000). Identify potential subcontracting opportunities based on your understanding of the contract objectives and possible task order topics. See answer to Question #2 as well.

4. **QUESTION:** Is the Small Business Plan to be submitted as a separate plan (page 58) or as part of the Business Plan (page 66)?

ANSWER: It should be submitted as a part of the Business Proposal.

5. **QUESTION:** Is it the intent of AHRQ, at this point, to understand the capabilities of institutions, rather than to receive specific project proposals?

ANSWER: AHRQ intends at this point to understand the capabilities of institutions.

6. **QUESTION:** Does AHRQ prefer to understand the breadth of capabilities available or to understand fewer capabilities in greater detail?

ANSWER: Awards will be made on the basis of the strength of the offeror's capabilities as outlined in their proposal as compared to the RFP objectives and evaluation criteria.

7. **QUESTION:** Will AHRQ be holding a conference and briefing for bidders?

ANSWER: No.

8. **QUESTION:** Will we be disqualified by not offering capabilities in any one of the specific areas of the contract objectives, research questions, or sample task order areas listed in the RFP?

ANSWER: Peer reviewers will award technical points based on your capabilities using the evaluation criteria in the RFP. Therefore, such a proposal as you describe may not receive as high a technical score as one who meets all the required capabilities. It will be the recommendation of the peer reviewers to determine if such a proposal is technically acceptable or not.

9. **QUESTION:** Because bioterrorism prevention, preparedness and response is such a new research and academic area, how will AHRQ evaluate related capabilities that can be adapted to the contract objectives, research questions, or sample task order areas listed in the RFP?

ANSWER: AHRQ views its role in bioterrorism prevention, preparedness, and response in the broader context of health services research and health care delivery. Solutions to many of the issues raised by the threat of bioterrorism are likely to be applicable to other problems as well, e.g., detection and appropriate management of comparably rare events. Standard processes for peer review of the responses will be used emphasizing the offeror's response to the evaluation criteria as stated in the RFP.

10. **QUESTION:** Objective 2 refers to the training of "clinicians," a term that would benefit from a

definition. The same objective mentions “rare events, including infectious diseases.....”; what else would be included, since this is a bioterrorism initiative?

ANSWER: “Clinicians” includes physicians, nurses (including nurse practitioners), and physician’s assistants.

The American Heart Association realizes that a single evaluation of knowledge and skills in basic life support and cardiopulmonary resuscitation or in advanced cardiac life support does not guarantee that the provider will indefinitely retain the fundamentals of the curriculum. Few clinicians have been trained to recognize and treat the diseases likely to be disseminated by a bioterrorist attack, but any expertise conferred by specific training will predictably deteriorate if everyday practice provides no opportunity to exercise relevant skills. AHRQ expects the Bioterrorism Initiative to serve as a model to clarify how best to develop and maintain clinical competence to deal with any specified conditions that are too rare for conventional professional experience to provide adequate familiarity. These conditions would include infections spread by terrorists, naturally occurring infections, and noninfectious diseases of comparable public health impact. Conversely, AHRQ looks to exploit and adapt successful examples of how to effect and maintain adequate diagnostic and therapeutic proficiency in the management of diverse uncommon conditions to preparing for the threat of bioterrorism.

11. **QUESTION:** Objectives 5 and 6 pertain to linkages with public health agencies at the local, state and federal levels, as well as with other preparedness planning entities. One purpose of such linkages would certainly be effective BT preparedness training. How will these objectives relate to those of other major BT initiatives, such as those of the CDC, which has also assumed a prominent role in offering training in collaboration with multiple partners, including public health agencies and academic institutions?

ANSWER: CDC has longstanding and formal ties to state health departments, which in turn interact with health departments in counties and cities. AHRQ is particularly interested in reaching practitioners, who are expected to be the first to encounter patients affected by organisms released by bioterrorists. A particular concern is the relationship between practitioners and their local health departments and other relevant entities that operate outside the familiar orbits of office, clinic, and hospital. Many clinicians who have been in practice for years probably have little or no experience in dealing with their local and state health departments. The Bioterrorism Initiative seeks to determine how best to promote links between practitioners and public health and emergency preparedness authorities that will work effectively in the event of a bioterrorist attack as well as in naturally occurring emergencies.

12. **QUESTION:** Objective 7 is “To model capacity, costs, and impact of a bioterrorist event on

hospitals and integrated delivery systems.” The meaning of the term “capacity” in this context is unclear.

ANSWER: In this context, “capacity” refers to requirements for facilities, (especially general hospital, intensive care unit, and emergency department capacity) professional personnel, information systems (hardware and software), durable medical equipment, pharmaceuticals, biologicals, and supplies that may be required to respond to a bioterrorist attack.

13. **QUESTION:** Is this initiative limited to preparedness for biological incidents, as narrowly defined, or does it cover public health and medical preparedness for the broader range of weapons of mass destruction threats (chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear)?

ANSWER: The initiative is specifically concerned with terrorism involving the release of microorganisms or their toxins. However, as discussed above, AHRQ anticipates that principles and systems that will improve readiness to deal with bioterrorism will often be applicable to dealing with other emergencies and rare events.

14. **QUESTION:** In response to the task orders, are we required to respond to all or can we select individual topics to respond to?

ANSWER: Task orders will only be issued after award of the contracts. When a task order requirement is developed, each awardee will be provided a fair opportunity to be considered for the task order. A request for a task order proposal will be sent to awardees for submission of a brief technical and cost proposal. Contractors are not required to compete for a particular task order if it chooses not to do so (See H.1.10, page 18 of the RFP).

15. **QUESTION:** Clause F.3, page 12, requires submission of SF-294 and SF-295 reports plus a Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Report, while Clause L.13.B(f) also requires subcontracting reports “as directed by the Contracting Officer.” Please clarify exactly what reports will be required and the format of the SDB Participation Report identified on page 12.

ANSWER: The subcontracting reports mentioned in Clause L.13.B(f) refers to the SF-294 and SF-295. The SDB Participation Report should be submitted on Optional Form 312. This form is located in the Federal Acquisition Regulation. A copy will be provided as an attachment to the contracts when they are awarded.

16. **QUESTION:** The solicitation references the requirement for Cost and Pricing Data and Subcontractor Cost and Pricing Data. It is respectfully requested that these requirements be lifted based on the competitive nature of the procurement, expected multiple contract awards with individually competed task orders, and likely involvement of contractors/subcontractors/universities, etc., who do not have CAS approved cost accounting systems/approved rates.

ANSWER: Cost and pricing data for this proposal submission does not need to be certified. However, the requirement will remain in the contract as subsequent task order proposals may require the submission of certified cost and pricing data.

17. **QUESTION:** Clause H.6, Page 23, required H.1, H.2, H.3, and H.4 to be flowed down to subcontractors without substantive alteration and that award of any subcontract is subject to the written approval of the Contracting Officer. It is requested that these requirements be lifted for prime contractors who possess CPSR approved procurement systems and to prevent privity of contract issues between prime contractors and subcontractors.

ANSWER: These requirements remain in tact. However, clause H.1 does not need to be flowed down into the subcontract.

18. **QUESTION:** In Part II - Contract Clauses, page 26, FAR 52.215-12 should be deleted due to the competitive nature of this procurement and Clause 52.215-13 (modifications) inserted.

ANSWER: Both clauses remain. See answer to Question 16.

19. **QUESTION:** In Part II - Contract Clauses, request that FAR 52-227-1 be deleted because FAR 52.244-2 is included (see page 27).

ANSWER: Both clauses remain.

20. **QUESTION:** In Part I, Section A, the list of proposal section copy requirements does not match the requirements listed in Section L. Please clarify the required number of copies for each proposal section.

ANSWER: Please use the proposal section copy requirements in Section A. Section L requirements were typographical errors.

21. **QUESTION:** In Section M.3 evaluation criteria (Management Plan) states that “management of

each task and labor hours proposed” will be evaluated. Please explain which specific tasks (sample task order or other) that require a labor hour build up for this proposal.

ANSWER: The intended grammatical structure and therefore the meaning of the second sentence in the question above are not clear. The evaluation criteria include “the ability to achieve the delivery of performance requirements through an appropriate organizational structure and management systems, including the management of the personnel assigned to each task and the labor hours proposed.....” Offerors should explain who is responsible for making

management decisions, who answers to whom in their organization, and who will decide how much time important participants will devote to the task orders under the Bioterrorism Initiative.

22. **QUESTION:** Can a consultant be a “key person” we propose who is not a current employee of one of the team member companies but is a consultant to a team member?

ANSWER: Proposals that rely on external consultants for key roles will be scrutinized for documentation of the availability and commitment of the consultants as well as upon their expertise and cost. Offerors should consider whether a consultant may be too busy, too distant, or too costly for optimal interaction with the other members of the group and whether the consultant may not share the group’s sense of professional identification with the success of the proposal.

23. **QUESTION:** Can current Government employees act as consultants on their own time on this HHS contract?

ANSWER: No.

24. **QUESTION:** Our company policy is to use average rates by labor category – is that acceptable or do we have to use direct labor rates by individuals?

ANSWER: (I’ll answer) It is acceptable for your proposal submission. However, after a task order is awarded, requests for cost reimbursement should be submitted on direct labor rates by individuals.

25. **QUESTION:** Does Task/Delivery Orders under existing GSA Schedules or Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) type contracts satisfy the requirement for Past Performance Information?

ANSWER: These can be evaluated for past performance. However, the past performance

questionnaire should still be completed and returned in accordance with the directions in the RFP.

26. **QUESTION:** Are consultant fees limited to only \$500 per day? Today's employment environment for qualifications of a Ph.D. or Medical Doctor consultant suggest that consultant fees for that level of expertise are more appropriate at the \$800 per day range. Request a waive to the \$500 per day limit.

ANSWER: Consultants may be approved for payment at a rate higher than \$500 per day. The requirement is that Contracting Officer approval be obtained first.

27. **QUESTION:** What travel requirements are anticipated outside of the Washington, DC, area?

ANSWER: No foreign travel is anticipated. Apart from trips to Rockville, Maryland, travel requirements are not likely to exceed visits by key personnel to collaborating institutions within a circumscribed metropolitan area or region.

28. **QUESTION:** Will AHRQ provide a specific bioterrorism scenario(s) for cost modeling purposes?

ANSWER: No. The only cost information required with your proposal are your direct labor rates and indirect cost rates.

29. **QUESTION:** Will AHRQ provide cost information or cost assumptions that could be utilized in the cost model?

ANSWER: No, see answer to Question 28.

30. **QUESTION:** Should the Offeror submit its Small Disadvantaged Participation Plan as a separate proposal volume or as a section of its business proposal?

ANSWER: Please include it as part of the Business Proposal.

31. **QUESTION:** Are the recommended percentages in Paragraph L.13.B(g) to be based on total subcontracted dollars or total contract value?

ANSWER: Page 1 of the RFP stipulates that these goals are a percentage of total contract value for

the base period. As the maximum contract value for the base period is limited to \$2,000,000, please use \$2,000,000 as the estimated contract value.

32. QUESTION: Can the participation of HBCUs/MIs be used to help fulfill the 5% AHRQ recommended SDB goal?

ANSWER: Not at this time. However, you are encouraged to utilize HBCUs/MIs.

33. QUESTION: RFP Section L.10.a.4., last paragraph, instructs Offeror to furnish “....proof of employment of qualified staff,” but does not indicate what documentation is acceptable as proof of employment. Please clarify what constitutes acceptable “proof of employment of qualified staff” in terms of document format, content, and details. Also, to what classes of labor must this proof of employment, background information and resumes be provided, as discussed in L.10.a.4?

ANSWER: This requirement is deleted.

34. QUESTION: Will a tradeoff of years of experience for academic degree(s) or vice versa be permitted? If so, what tradeoffs will be acceptable for the various personnel classes (I-VI)? Please reference RFP section L.10, paragraph 4, “Key Personnel.”

ANSWER: Key personnel are expected to have both the specified academic credentials and the specified years of experience. Proposals for tradeoffs in qualifications need to be amply justified, will be judged on an individual basis, and will not necessarily be accepted.

35. QUESTION: Will the Government provide a Bidder’s List identifying those entities expressing interest in the AHRQ Bioterrorism Initiative procurement?

ANSWER: No bidders list exists as potential offerors downloaded the RFP from our Internet website and were not required to submit requests for the RFP in writing to AHRQ.

36. QUESTION: Please clarify the reference to “off-site, non-medical care facilities to provide care to large numbers of people.” RFP section C.2. states “...(4) to develop alternative models that would allow local health providers and institutions to use off-site, non-medical care facilities to provide care to large numbers of people...” In this context, is “off-site, non-medical” inclusive of stockpile sites, points of distribution, mass casualty collection points, or acute care centers?

ANSWER: A bioterrorist threat or attack may drive large numbers of people to seek prophylaxis or treatment for imagined, anticipated, or manifest infection or intoxication. Such a surge of worried or ill patients might swamp extant medical facilities, including emergency rooms, urgent care centers, hospitals, clinics, ambulatory surgical centers, and practitioners' offices. There is a need to determine where and how in the community these people, as well as the normal background of patients with acute and chronic problems, can best be cared for.

37. **QUESTION:** We recommend that the Government consider handling this procurement as an Other than Cost or Pricing Data submission. L.13.A (1-3) "Business Proposal" instructs the Offeror to provide "certified" rates and documentation, and to submit Cost or Pricing Data. Assuming adequate competition will be achieved in this procurement, it is requested that the requirement for "certified" rates and documentation, and the requirement for submission of Cost or Pricing Data be removed. Instead, it is requested that this procurement be handled under Alternate IV of FAR 52.215-20 as an Other than Cost or Pricing Data submission.

ANSWER: Cost and pricing data does not need to be certified. See the answer to Question 16.

38. **QUESTION:** Please consider removing the invoicing requirement to furnish individual's names, titles, hours worked and total cost by person, as well as the detailed breakdown by consultant of hours and costs, travel detail information, subcontractor detail and equipment detail costs from the invoicing requirement, and instead allow the contractor(s) to furnish this information on its monthly task order financial progress reports. Our invoices typically report costs at the general ledger account level, and it would be extremely costly and cause delays in invoicing for the billing clerk to add this requirement (RFP Section G.4). These types of detailed reporting requirements are usually accomplished on a direct charge basis by the Program Manager.

ANSWER: As the task orders will be issued on a cost-reimbursement basis, it is necessary that we have the opportunity to review each cost to determine allowability and allocability. An invoice with costs at the general ledger account level would only be acceptable if the required detailed financial information was attached to the invoice for our review.

39. **QUESTION:** Section E.1 indicates inspection and acceptance is to be performed by either the CO or the Government Project Officer (GPO), whereas F.3 indicates that delivered items are to be

approved by the Task Order Officer (TOO). G.2. also indicates responsibility for inspection and acceptance by both the GPO and TOO. Please clarify whether approval by the TOO is in addition to the E.1 officials designated for inspection and acceptance.

ANSWER: The Government Project Officer is authorized to represent the Contracting Officer in providing overall technical guidance and oversight to the contract as a whole. A Task Order Officer will be designated for each Task Order awarded, and that individual will represent Contracting Officer in providing overall technical guidance, oversight, inspection and acceptance of work under that particular Task Order only.

40. **QUESTION:** Section L.4 indicates that the task orders are to be issued on a CPFF Completion basis. Please clarify why there is an invoicing requirement to provide details of individuals' names, titles, hours worked, for Direct Labor, Consultants and Subcontractors.

ANSWER: It is necessary that we have the opportunity to review each cost to determine allowability and allocability.

41. **QUESTION:** Section H.3(e), second paragraph - It is requested that the second sentence be revised to exclude those cases where Government officers, agents and employees are either partially or solely at fault.

ANSWER: This clause is an approved FAR Deviation and cannot be changed for this solicitation.

42. **QUESTION:** Does AHRQ want to receive proposals for specific projects that respond to the contract objectives, research questions or examples of task orders?

ANSWER: No, we are not requesting proposals for specific task orders at this time.

43. **QUESTION:** Without knowledge of specific tasks, what are AHRQ's expectations for solicitation and evaluation of past performance and small and disadvantaged business plans?

ANSWER: The RFP states the objectives of the contract and lists potential task order topics. Past performance should relate to similar studies, assessments, evaluations, etc. Page 1 of the RFP lists recommended goals. The maximum dollar value of task orders per contractor, per year, is

\$2,000,000. It is requested that you apply your goals, using \$2,000,000 as the contract value for the base year.

44. **QUESTION:** Will your consideration of submitted questions, your development of answers and then response, delay the date for proposal submission?

ANSWER: The date and hour for receipt of proposals remain unchanged.

45. **QUESTION:** In the technical proposal instructions collaboration among multiple institutions is encouraged. However, the cost proposal calls for submission of unloaded labor rates which are considered by most organizations as highly sensitive business proprietary information. Would AHRQ consider revising its instructions to ask for fully loaded rates instead? Or would it be acceptable to submit separate labor rates in sealed bids for each subcontractor involved?

ANSWER: We want to review unloaded labor rates. The submission of sealed bids from each subcontractor is acceptable.

46. **QUESTION:** There appears to be a contradiction in the instructions regarding the Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Plan (SDBP). In L.9.c, the SDBP is described as one of four separate and complete in itself parts. In L.12.A., offerors are instructed to place the SDBP information in “one clearly marked section of their business proposal.” Which instruction should be followed?

ANSWER: The Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Plan and the Small Business Subcontracting Plan should both be included in the Business Proposal. L.9.c. is amended to read:

c. Separation of Technical, Past Performance Information, Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Plan and Business Proposal: The proposal shall be in three parts:

(1) Technical Proposal; (2) Past Performance Information; and (3) Business Proposal (which includes the Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Plan and the Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Each of the parts shall be separate and complete in itself so that evaluation of one may be accomplished independently of, and concurrently with, evaluation of the other. The technical proposal shall not contain reference to cost; however resources information, such as data concerning labor hours and categories, materials, subcontracts, etc., shall be contained in the technical proposal so that your understanding of the Statement of Work (SOW) may be evaluated. It must disclose your technical approach in as much detail as possible, including, but not limited to, the requirements of the technical proposal instructions.

47. **QUESTION:** On Page 4 of the Solicitation, Paragraph B.2 states: “The Contractor shall be reimbursed on a cost-reimbursement basis. Each task order awarded under this contract shall include one or more of the labor categories in Section B.3, and the Contractor shall be reimbursed for costs incurred for labor based on the following hourly rates. All other costs, i.e., travel, supplies, etc., shall be reimbursed in accordance with individual cost proposals received under task orders.” Is it the Government’s intent for the rates stipulated under B.3. to be ceiling not-to-exceed rates for task order bidding purposes? It is the Contractor’s assumption that in performance the Contractor shall be able to invoice the actual costs of personnel performing the effort plus fee up to the total amount allotted to the order, and that there will be no individual labor category rate ceilings nor labor category total amount ceilings that will be established at the task order level, provided the Contractor does not exceed the total amount funded in the order.

Similarly, it is the Contractor’s assumption that no individual Other Direct Cost element ceilings will be stipulated on orders provided the Contractor does not exceed the total amount allotted to the order. Please clarify.

ANSWER: The labor rates provided in your proposal are intended to be not-to-exceed, ceiling rates. When submitting a proposal for an actual task order request, actual rates should be proposed. However, if the actual labor cost exceeds the ceiling rate in the contract, you will only be reimbursed at the ceiling rate.

48. **QUESTION:** Page 4, Paragraph B.3 stipulates: “The following labor rates are NOT loaded rates.” Will a separate set of rates for the Contractor and each subcontractor be included in the contract? How does a prime contractor show rates for subcontractors when subcontractor rates considers its “unburned” rates proprietary?

ANSWER: Subcontractors may submit this information in a sealed envelope to the Contracting Officer by the date and time established for receipt of proposals.

49. **QUESTION:** Page 12 of the Solicitation states the SF-294 is to be submitted April 30 and October 30 and states (Annually) next to each date. Should this state Semi-Annually? Please clarify.

ANSWER: It merely means that the report is to be submitted on April 30 and October 30 each year.

50. **QUESTION:** Page 14 states that vouchers shall include “all persons, listing the person’s name, title, number of hours or days worked, the total cost per person and a total amount of this category.”

Would the Government consider revising the invoicing requirements for direct labor to include the total hours and total amount by labor category as opposed to by person, due to the administrative cost associated with providing and tracking said information by person for both the Contractor and the Government?

ANSWER: As task orders will be awarded on a cost reimbursement basis, it is necessary for us to be able to review costs on an individual basis rather than by labor category.

51. **QUESTION:** On Page 18 of the Solicitation: Will the Government consider accepting task order proposals stating total amounts by labor category rather than by person, if the resumes of key personnel are provided to the Government with each task order proposal submission? There may be substantive reasons for bidding company category average labor rates as opposed to individual actual labor rates to allow for maximum flexibility for both the Contractor and the Government. This question also applies to the submission of the Business Proposal in response to the subject solicitation.

ANSWER: For purposes of responding to this solicitation, it is acceptable to provide a range of direct labor rates within each Class. It is understood that within each Class, there can be a wide range of labor rates. A range of labor rates is preferred to an average labor rate per category. However, when submitting proposals for specific task order requests, contractors will be required to propose individual labor rates for the persons being proposed and costs will be reimbursed based on the individual's direct labor rates.

52. **QUESTION:** Will AHRQ consider either making a single award based on the current Request for Proposal (RFP) or reducing current RFP requirements? We ask this question based on the following rationale. The extensive proposal, which AHRQ is currently requiring (a 125+ page technical proposal that covers all functional and technical areas, plus personnel qualifications), is a major effort and should produce comprehensive proposals of sufficient depth and detail for the government to determine the single best team to execute the Bioterrorism Initiative.

ANSWER: AHRQ will accept proposals from one or more offerors as the Agency judges is most likely to realize successfully the objectives of the Bioterrorism Initiative. AHRQ is not committed to

selecting a single offeror as “the single best team..” The RFP requirements will not be reduced. The referenced 125-page limit is a maximum; not a minimum nor even a suggested page limit. Offerors should go into the depth they feel is necessary to respond to the requirements of the solicitation and to respond to the evaluation criteria stipulated in the solicitation.

53. QUESTION: If AHRQ does not think a major proposal is enough to make a single award, but would prefer to evaluate contractors on their response to actual task orders (TO), then we believe it is in the government’s interest to have a large number of teams competing for each specific TO. Under this contingency, a large, expensive proposal that simply qualifies a company to compete for work would discourage companies from bidding (thereby obviating the value of potential competition for individual Tos). Therefore, to ensure healthy competition at the TO level, the government should make it easier and less expensive for them to compete. An initial proposal of 20 pages that summarizes a team’s qualifications in each of the specified areas, along with past performance questionnaires, could be sufficient for AHRQ to judge who is

qualified to compete (not to win) and produce a sufficiently large number of contractor to ensure spirited competition at the TO level.

ANSWER: The referenced 125-page limit is a maximum; not a minimum nor even a suggested page limit. Offerors should go into the depth they feel is necessary to respond to the requirements of the solicitation and to respond to the evaluation criteria stipulated in the solicitation. Individual task order proposals are not envisioned to be lengthy as those contractors awarded contracts will already be considered capable of performing the task orders. A brief technical approach and a cost proposal will be requested when a task order is being competed.

54. QUESTION: Can an organization submit multiple topics for multiple task orders? If so, can this be included in one technical proposal or would there have to be multiple proposals for each of the topics?

ANSWER: We are not requesting the submission of topics for task orders at this time.